

Title: Subphenotypes of youth-onset type 2 diabetes mellitus and their association with distal symmetrical polyneuropathy

Author Names: Jiali Guo^{1,2}, Zhongyu Li³, Rodrigo M. Carrillo-Larco^{1,2}, Daniel S. Hsia^{4,5}, Jessica L Harding⁶, Mohammed K. Ali^{1,2,7}, Jithin Sam Varghese^{1,2}

Author Affiliations:

1 Emory Global Diabetes Research Center of Woodruff Health Sciences Center and Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA.

2 Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

3 Nutrition and Health Sciences Doctoral Program, Laney Graduate School, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

4 Department of Endocrinology, Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, Atlanta, USA

5 Department of Pediatrics, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, USA

6 Department of Surgery, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, USA

7 Department of Preventive & Family Medicine, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, USA

Corresponding Author: Jithin Sam Varghese, Emory Global Diabetes Research Center, Woodruff Health Sciences Center, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, 30322, USA; Phone: +1 (404) 502-0415, E-mail: jvargh7@emory.edu

Short running head: Youth-onset type 2 diabetes subphenotypes

Abbreviations: MNSI, Michigan Neuropathy Screening Instrument; T1DM, Type 1 Diabetes; T2DM, Type 2 Diabetes; DAA, Diabetes Associated Antibody; DSPN, Distal Symmetric Polyneuropathy; yMOD, Youth-onset Mild Obesity-related Diabetes; ySIDD, Youth-onset Severe Insulin-Deficient Diabetes; ySIRD, Youth-onset Severe Insulin-Resistant Diabetes

ABSTRACT

Context: Individuals with youth-onset type 2 diabetes mellitus (T2DM) display substantial, but unexplained, heterogeneity in their clinical presentations and risk of complications such as diabetic neuropathy. Data-driven clustering may be useful in characterizing this heterogeneity.

Objective: To identify data-driven subphenotypes of newly diagnosed youth-onset T2DM and study their association with distal symmetric polyneuropathy (DSPN) at time of diagnosis.

Design: Cross-sectional

Setting: USA

Participants: 641 individuals with newly diagnosed T2DM aged 10-19 years from the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study and the Treatment Options for Type 2 Diabetes in Adolescents and Youth (TODAY) study.

Exposure(s): Body mass index, HbA1c, fasting C-peptide, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, LDL cholesterol and HDL cholesterol

Main Outcome Measures: Data-driven subphenotypes were identified from k-means clustering. The cross-sectional association of subphenotypes with DSPN, based on expert examination scores (≥ 2.5) from the Michigan Neuropathy Screening Instrument, were assessed using Poisson regressions with robust standard errors.

Results: Among 641 youth-onset T2DM, 58.2% were female, with 38.2% of participants ≤ 13 years having average BMI of 34.5 kg/m^2 (SD: 6.5 kg/m^2), and average HbA1c of 6.1% (IQR: 5.6-7.0). Three youth-onset subphenotypes were identified: mild obesity related diabetes (yMOD, 48.5%), severe insulin deficient diabetes (ySIDD, 18.7%) and severe insulin resistant

diabetes (ySIRD, 32.7%). After adjusting for covariates, the prevalence of abnormal DSPN were 2.58 (95%CI: 1.74, 3.81) and 2.02 (95%CI: 1.40, 2.93) times among those classified as the ySIDD and ySIRD subphenotypes, relative to the yMOD subphenotype.

Conclusions: Youth-onset T2DM consisted of heterogeneous clinical subphenotypes with differences prevalence of DSPN. Management of youth-onset T2DM may need to consider strategies tailored to each subphenotype.

Keywords: precision medicine, diabetes endotypes, clusters

1 **Introduction**

2 Youth-onset type 2 diabetes (T2DM) is rapidly increasing in prevalence in the United
3 States with 12.5 cases per 100,000 individuals aged 10 to 19 years.^{1,2} The pathophysiology
4 involves inadequate insulin secretion compensating for insulin resistance from puberty and
5 excess adiposity, often among those with a family history of diabetes.^{3,4,5} Previous research
6 suggests that youth-onset T2DM exists on a spectrum with heterogeneity in the rate of decline of
7 beta-cell function, response to treatment, and risk of complications by sex, baseline glycemic
8 control, race-ethnicity, and age at diagnosis.⁴ A precision medicine approach, which recognizes
9 the observed heterogeneity of youth-onset T2DM, could therefore inform diagnosis and
10 treatment interventions.⁶

11 The heterogeneity in clinical presentation and risk of complications of youth-onset
12 T2DM are driven by a complex pathophysiology of glucotoxicity, insulin resistance, and
13 lipotoxicity, that existing classifications do not address.^{7,8} First, patients exist on a spectrum of
14 insulin resistance and secretion that not captured by current subgroups based on presence or
15 absence of islet antibodies and abdominal obesity.^{9,10} Second, existing classifications are not
16 useful for risk stratification since they do not consider differences in prognosis of youth-onset
17 T2DM. For instance, youth-onset T2DM patients display a high burden of microvascular
18 complications such as peripheral neuropathy with nearly 35% cumulative incidence at 15 years
19 after diagnosis,^{1,11} which may depend on factors like age, BMI, inflammation, and medications
20 (e.g., insulin). Moreover, characterizing the heterogeneity in clinical presentation of youth-onset
21 T2DM can be improved by considering the extent of dysglycemia, high blood pressure and high
22 cholesterol at diagnosis, which are associated with elevated risk of complications.

23 Recent studies of data-driven classification of newly diagnosed cases of diabetes (T1DM,
24 latent autoimmune diabetes, and T2DM) have identified five frequently replicated subgroups
25 (i.e., subphenotypes): mild age-related diabetes (MARD), mild obesity-related diabetes (MOD),
26 severe insulin resistant diabetes (SIRD), severe insulin-deficient diabetes (SIDD), and severe
27 autoimmune diabetes (SAID), based on six variables (GAD antibodies, HbA1c, BMI, age,
28 HOMA2-B, HOMA2-IR).^{12,13} These subphenotypes are associated with differences in response
29 to treatments and risk of distal symmetric polyneuropathy (DSPN).¹⁴ For example, relative to
30 other subphenotypes, SIDD and SIRD were associated with the highest risk of DSPN. Therefore,
31 using data of the two largest studies of youth-onset T2DM from the USA, our objectives were to
32 1) identify data-driven subphenotypes of newly diagnosed youth-onset T2DM; and 2) to study
33 their associations with DSPN at T2DM diagnosis. Findings from this study can improve risk
34 stratification of newly diagnosed youth-onset T2DM cases.

35 **Materials and Methods**

36 *Study Population*

37 *SEARCH*

38 The SEARCH for Diabetes in the Youth Study consists of a registry of existing and
39 newly diagnosed diabetes (T1DM, T2DM, other types, or hybrids) who were 19 years or
40 younger, from six clinical centers in Ohio, Colorado, Washington, South Carolina, Southern
41 California and Hawaii.¹⁰ The first four sites identified cases from a geographically defined
42 population, while the latter two identified participants from the membership of a participating
43 health plan, i.e. Kaiser Permanente. SEARCH consists of four phases of enrollment (Phase 1:

44 2000-05, Phase 2: 2005-10, Phase 3: 2010-15, Phase 4: 2015-20). Cross-sectional data from
45 enrollment was used for each participant in this study.

46 *TODAY*

47 The Treatment Options for Type 2 Diabetes in Adolescents and Youth (TODAY) study
48 was a multicenter, randomized control trial of metformin monotherapy, compared to alternative
49 approaches (metformin + rosiglitazone, metformin + lifestyle intervention) among newly
50 diagnosed T2DM (<2 years and autoantibody negative) for individuals aged 10-17 years who did
51 not require insulin and were overweight or obese (BMI > 85th percentile).¹⁵ Duration of diabetes
52 was ≤5 months for 48% of participants. Cross-sectional data from the enrollment wave before
53 intervention allocation were used for this analysis.

54 *Type 2 Diabetes Diagnostic Criteria*

55 Diabetes cases in the SEARCH study were validated through one of two primary criteria:
56 a physician's diagnosis of diabetes, or self-reporting of a physician's diagnosis by the patient (or
57 their parent) during an interview or survey. A physician diagnosis was considered confirmed if it
58 met any of the following conditions: medical record review that reveals a physician's diagnosis
59 of diabetes; direct verification of the diagnosis, or a referral to the study by a clinician; listing of
60 diabetes as an underlying or contributing cause of death on a death certificate; inclusion in a
61 clinical database that mandates clinician verification of the diagnosis.

62 T2DM cases in the TODAY study were diagnosed according to the American Diabetes
63 Association (ADA) criteria,¹⁶ with confirmation via documented medical records. The diagnosis
64 was established based on one or more laboratory parameters: fasting glucose ≥126 mg/dL,
65 random glucose ≥200 mg/dL, or a two-hour oral glucose tolerance test (OGTT) glucose ≥200

66 mg/dL. For patients with normal fasting glucose and elevated two-hour glucose levels during the
67 OGTT, the HbA1c must be $\geq 6\%$ as per the study protocol.¹⁷ Additionally, for patients who had
68 been previously diagnosed with diabetes and were on medication at the time of screening for
69 eligibility in this study, HbA1c $\geq 8\%$ at the time of their initial diagnosis was considered
70 sufficient evidence of eligibility if no documented laboratory determination of serum glucose
71 was available.

72 *Analytic Sample*

73 We included all newly diagnosed participants aged 10 to 19 years. Newly diagnosed
74 diabetes was defined as a duration of diabetes of ≤ 5 months at enrollment in TODAY, and ≤ 1
75 year in SEARCH. Participants from the SEARCH study were included if they were not classified
76 as type 1 diabetes or Maturity Onset Diabetes of the Young (MODY), i.e. they were classified as
77 type 2 or unknown form of diabetes based on etiologic evidence by expert adjudicators
78 (**Supplementary Figure 1**). We excluded participants who were missing body mass index
79 (BMI) at enrollment in either study. Additionally, we excluded participants for whom all blood-
80 based laboratory biomarker assessments were unavailable. Our final analytic sample consisted of
81 641 participants with newly diagnosed youth-onset T2DM from both TODAY (n=337) and
82 SEARCH (n=304) studies.

83 *Data collection and variable specification*

84 *Clinical characteristics of youth-onset T2DM*

85 We extracted relevant socio-demographics and clinical characteristics of the analytic
86 sample for both studies. Socio-demographic data included sex, age (harmonized across studies as
87 ≤ 13 , 14-15, >15 years based on data sharing policies), and race and ethnicity (Non-Hispanic

88 Black, Non-Hispanic White, Hispanic, Non-Hispanic Other). Clinical characteristics included
89 vitals such as BMI, systolic and diastolic blood pressure; laboratory parameters such as
90 hemoglobin A1c (HbA1c), fasting C-peptide, fasting glucose, fasting insulin, total cholesterol,
91 low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, and
92 triglyceride levels (measurement protocols in **Supplementary Table 1**); and self-reported usage
93 of insulin among SEARCH participants. Since the data of TODAY study were extracted from
94 the enrollment wave, we did not use the information on treatment group assignment.

95 *Distal symmetrical polyneuropathy*

96 Cross-sectional assessment of DSPN was conducted using the validated Michigan
97 Neuropathy Screening Instrument (MNSI) for both SEARCH and TODAY.¹⁸ The MNSI
98 measurement consisted of two separate assessments, an expert examination and a self-
99 administered questionnaire. During the 4-item expert examination that included inspection and
100 assessment of vibratory sensation and ankle reflexes, a health professional inspects each foot for
101 deformities, dry skin, calluses, infections and fissures. The total possible score of all
102 examinations is 8 points and, in the published scoring algorithm, a score ≥ 2.5 is considered
103 abnormal and indicative of DSPN.¹⁹ Additionally, the self-administered questionnaire consists
104 of 15 questions, where each response counts as one point. Responses to impaired circulation and
105 general asthenia were excluded in the published scoring algorithm (≥ 4 indicative of DSPN).¹⁹

106 *Statistical Analysis*

107 *Data-driven clustering to identify subphenotypes of T2DM*

108 We calculated age-adjusted variables for clustering as residuals from the linear regression
109 of each of these seven variables on age.²⁰ We used these variables to perform an exploratory k-

110 means cluster analysis (k: 2 to 10). We identified the optimal number of clusters using a
111 combination of an elbow plot (**Supplementary Figure 2**) and clinically meaningful sample sizes
112 within each cluster across different numbers of clusters. This approach determined that three
113 clusters represented the optimal solution for classifying the analytic sample into subphenotypes.
114 We compared clinical characteristics between the clusters to inform our labeling of
115 subphenotypes. To compare our findings with existing classifications based on adiposity, we
116 compared the overlap of the three subphenotypes with tertiles of BMI.¹⁰ To account for
117 missingness (<5%) in variables that were used to identify the data-driven clusters (i.e., BMI,
118 HbA1c, fasting C-peptide, systolic blood pressure, diastolic blood pressure, LDL cholesterol, or
119 HDL cholesterol) and missing indicators in the MNSI examination, we used a non-parametric
120 single imputation method (k-nearest neighbors; k = 5). Clusters were then labelled after
121 comparing their clinical characteristics and their similarities to adult-onset subphenotypes.

122 *Association of subphenotypes with DSPN*

123 We conducted a cross-sectional analysis of the pooled dataset of SEARCH and TODAY.
124 We excluded individuals who did not have any MNSI measurement at the time of inclusion in
125 the study and accounted for missing DSPN indicators using inverse probability weights.²¹ We
126 estimated the association of membership in subphenotypes with DSPN (as defined by abnormal
127 examination scores), and used yMOD as the reference group, adjusting for age, sex and race-
128 ethnicity. We used modified Poisson regressions to estimate prevalence ratios and 95% robust
129 confidence intervals.

130 *Sensitivity Analysis*

131 First, to study if the identification protocol for youth-onset T2DM in SEARCH may have
132 biased our results, we repeated the analysis using two alternative definitions provided by the
133 SEARCH investigators: a) cases with negative or missing diabetes-associated autoantibodies,
134 and b) an initial provider classification including all known T2DM and cases of unknown
135 etiology. Next, to address the potential bias from missing MNSI data, we excluded cases lacking
136 DSPN indicators and conducted a sensitivity analysis focusing exclusively on complete cases.
137 Finally, given that the TODAY study used highly restrictive inclusion criteria of non-insulin
138 dependent T2DM, and considering the broader diversity within the SEARCH study, we repeated
139 the analysis using only the SEARCH dataset.

140 All analysis was carried out using R 4.3.3 and Python 3.12.4.

141 **Results**

142 Our analytic sample consisted of 641 participants aged 10-19 years with newly diagnosed
143 T2DM. Of these 304 (47.4%) were from the SEARCH cohort study, and 337 (52.6%) were from
144 the TODAY trial. The study population were 58.2% female with 38.2% of participants ≤ 13 years
145 of age at T2DM diagnosis. Non-Hispanic White, non-Hispanic Black, and Hispanic individuals
146 each accounted for approximately 30% of the sample, and non-Hispanic other races made up
147 8.7% of the sample. Individuals excluded from the analytic sample ($n = 77$) for missing DSPN
148 indicators in SEARCH were more likely to be ≤ 13 years (67.5% versus 35.5%) and Non-
149 Hispanic White (64.9% versus 32.2%) (**Supplementary Table 2**).

150 The average BMI of the study population was 34.5 kg/m^2 (SD: 6.5 kg/m^2). The mean
151 HbA1c level was 6.1% (IQR: 5.6%, 7.0%), while the average systolic and diastolic blood
152 pressures were 114.2 mmHg (SD: 11.6 mmHg) and 68.8 mmHg (SD: 9.7 mmHg), respectively
153 (**Table 1**). Descriptive characteristics stratified by sex for SEARCH and TODAY are provided in

154 **Supplementary Table 3.** Missing data for variables used in clustering were <5%

155 **(Supplementary Table 4).**

156 *Identification of Subphenotypes*

157 Three clusters were identified after k-means clustering of age-adjusted variables

158 **(Supplementary Table 5).** Cluster 1, comprising 120 (18.7%) individuals, had lower BMI and

159 fasting C-peptide but higher values of HDL cholesterol and HbA1c compared to the other

160 subphenotypes, and was therefore labeled as youth-onset severe insulin deficient diabetes

161 (ySIDD). Cluster 2, which included 311 (48.5%) out of the 641 participants, was characterized

162 by higher BMI and lower HbA1c relative to ySIDD and was labeled as youth-onset mild obesity

163 related diabetes (yMOD). Cluster 3, labeled as severe insulin resistant diabetes (ySIRD),

164 containing 210 (32.7%) participants with highest values of BMI, fasting C-peptide, blood

165 pressure, and LDL cholesterol, and lower values of HbA1c and HDL cholesterol compared to

166 ySIDD **(Figure, Table 1)**. Of all ySIDD cases, 72.5% belonged to the lowest BMI tertile while

167 63.3% of ySIRD cases belonged to the highest BMI tertile **(Supplementary Table 6)**. Vitals and

168 laboratory parameters of subphenotypes were similar when clustering was conducted separately

169 by sex **(Supplementary Table 7)**.

170 *Association between subphenotypes and DSPN*

171 Of the total analytic sample, 140 participants did not have any MNSI scores, and 14

172 participants had at least one missing item from the MNSI measurements at study inclusion

173 **(Supplementary Table 8)**. Relative to the yMOD subphenotype, the prevalence of individuals

174 with DSPN based on examination scores were 2.73 (PR; 95%CI: 1.84, 4.04) and 2.30 (95%CI:

175 1.59, 3.34) times among those classified as the ySIDD and ySIRD subphenotypes respectively

176 after accounting for non-response to MNSI examination (**Table 2**). After adjusting for age, sex
177 and race/ethnicity, the prevalence of participants with abnormal DSPN based on the examination
178 were 2.58 (95%CI: 1.74, 3.81) and 2.02 (95%CI: 1.40, 2.93) times among those classified as the
179 ySIDD and ySIRD subphenotypes, relative to the yMOD subphenotype.

180 *Sensitivity Analysis*

181 The sample based on cases with negative or missing autoantibodies consisted of 722
182 newly diagnosed T2DM cases aged 10–19 years. Among these, 46.8% belonged to the yMOD
183 subphenotype, 22.2% were in the ySIDD subphenotype, and 31.0% were classified as the ySIRD
184 subphenotype (**Supplementary Table 9**). Based on the initial provider diagnosis criterion, the
185 analytic sample included 640 participants, with 46.7% classified as yMOD, 21.9% as ySIDD,
186 and 31.4% as ySIRD (**Supplementary Table 10**). The means and SDs of the seven clustering
187 variables were similar across different diagnostic criteria. We also did not observe any
188 significant differences in the means and SDs of the clustering variables between our study
189 sample (main clusters), the complete cases, and the clusters derived from clustering the
190 SEARCH sample (**Supplementary Figure 4**). Prevalence of DSPN (relative to yMOD) were
191 higher for ySIDD and ySIRD classified according to the autoantibody classification and initial
192 provider classification (**Supplementary Table 11; Supplementary Figure 5**). However, for the
193 SEARCH-only sample, the prevalence of DSPN among those classified as the ySIDD and
194 ySIRD subphenotypes was similar to yMOD (**Supplementary Table 11**).

195 **Discussion**

196 In this study, we identified three subphenotypes of youth-onset T2D based on laboratory
197 parameters and vitals – yMOD, ySIDD and ySIRD. The latter two subphenotypes—ySIDD and

198 ySIRD—showed a higher prevalence of abnormal DSPN symptoms at T2DM diagnosis
199 compared to the yMOD subphenotype. This suggests that identifying these subphenotypes early
200 could enhance risk stratification, as ySIDD and ySIRD patients appear to be more susceptible to
201 DSPN. Therefore, implementing diagnostic algorithms in electronic health records to detect
202 these subphenotypes and monitor DSPN risk can potentially lead to improved patient outcomes.

203 Consistent with our findings, most studies among adult-onset T2DM reported a higher
204 proportion of individuals as the MOD subphenotype and lower proportion of adults classified as
205 SIDD and SIRD subphenotypes.²² Despite differences in age of onset of 40 years or more in the
206 adult studies, the clinical characteristics of adult-onset subphenotypes resembled those of youth-
207 onset subphenotypes. For instance in the German Diabetes Study (GDS) and All New Diabetics
208 in Scania (ANDIS) cohort from Sweden, BMI was higher among adult-onset SIRD and MOD, as
209 compared with adult-onset SIDD (**Supplementary Table 12**).^{12,14} Furthermore, consistent with
210 findings from these studies, HbA1c was higher among adult-onset SIDD, relative to adult-onset
211 SIRD and adult-onset MOD. Additionally, we observed greater burden of DSPN among the
212 ySIDD and ySIRD subphenotypes, relative to yMOD, consistent with evidence from adult-onset
213 SIDD and SIRD in the GDS.¹⁴

214 The increasing incidence of DSPN among children and youth with type 1 diabetes was
215 previously highlighted, and is associated with higher risk of ulcers and non-traumatic
216 amputation.²³ Our findings suggest add to the evidence that burden of DSPN among youth-onset
217 T2DM may be further exacerbated by obesity,²⁴ based on membership in ySIDD and ySIRD
218 subphenotypes. Furthermore, reports from TODAY and SEARCH studies suggest that rates of
219 DSPN in youth-onset T2DM are higher than those in T1DM, comparable to adult-onset
220 T2DM.²⁵⁻²⁷ However, nearly 50% of DSPN are also asymptomatic with contributing factors such

221 male sex, poor glycemic control, duration of diabetes, high BMI, low HDL cholesterol, and
222 smoking.^{25,26} Despite this, the underlying etiology and strategies for preventing or managing
223 DSPN in children and youth with diabetes remain unclear. The variations in prevalence across
224 the subphenotypes identified in this study can improve diagnosis and management through risk
225 stratification.

226 Our study enhances the risk stratification of youth-onset T2DM using seven biomarkers
227 to better capture the heterogeneity in clinical presentation.¹⁰ However, there are several
228 limitations to consider. These findings should be interpreted as exploratory given the small
229 sample size (N = 641) which may have left us underpowered to detect small and clinically
230 meaningful differences between subphenotypes of T2DM, including in responses to treatment by
231 intervention group in the TODAY study. Moreover, we were unable to incorporate the nuances
232 of different study designs and mechanisms of participant selection of the SEARCH and TODAY
233 studies in the clustering. For instance, the SEARCH cohort was not limited to T2DM, whereas
234 the TODAY trial had more restrictive recruitment criteria, including non-insulin dependent
235 T2DM, and we were unable to identify individuals with duration of youth-onset T2DM between
236 6 and 12 months. Nevertheless, our study provides preliminary data from the most
237 comprehensive databases of youth-onset T2DM and documents the heterogeneity of T2DM.

238 *Conclusion*

239 In summary, our study introduced a novel data-driven classification for youth-onset
240 T2DM, underscoring a higher burden of DSPN among some subphenotypes that may be useful
241 in defining a precision medicine approach to managing youth-onset T2DM to prevent morbidity
242 from complications. Further research is needed to validate these findings in larger and more
243 diverse longitudinal datasets. Additionally, longitudinal studies are essential for tracking the

244 development of DSPN in individuals who are initially free at diagnosis of youth-onset T2DM
245 and for exploring the potential advantages of tailored treatment strategies for these novel
246 subphenotypes.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: We were exempt from ethical approval by the Institutional Review Board of Emory University. All participants gave written informed consent before participation in both SEARCH and TODAY studies.

Data availability statement: The code for the analysis is available on https://github.com/jvargh7/diabetes_subphenotypes_youth. Data for SEARCH and TODAY are available from the NIDDK Biorepository.

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Competing interests: None declared

Funding: P30DK111024 (Ali)

Author contributions: JSV, ZL and JG conceptualized the study. JG conducted the analysis and wrote the first draft with inputs from ZL and JSV. All authors reviewed and edited subsequent drafts.

References

1. Perng W, Conway R, Mayer-Davis E, Dabelea D. Youth-Onset Type 2 Diabetes: The Epidemiology of an Awakening Epidemic. *Diabetes Care*. 2023;46(3):490-499. doi:10.2337/dci22-0046
2. Rodriguez IM, O'Sullivan KL. Youth-Onset Type 2 Diabetes: Burden of Complications and Socioeconomic Cost. *Curr Diab Rep*. 2023;23(5):59-67. doi:10.1007/s11892-023-01501-7
3. Arslanian S, Bacha F, Grey M, Marcus MD, White NH, Zeitler P. Evaluation and Management of Youth-Onset Type 2 Diabetes: A Position Statement by the American Diabetes Association. *Diabetes Care*. 2018;41(12):2648-2668. doi:10.2337/dci18-0052
4. Shah AS, Nadeau KJ, Dabelea D, Redondo MJ. Spectrum of Phenotypes and Causes of Type 2 Diabetes in Children. *Annu Rev Med*. 2022;73:501-515. doi:10.1146/annurev-med-042120-012033
5. McGavock J, Wicklow B, Dart AB. Type 2 diabetes in youth is a disease of poverty. *The Lancet*. 2017;390(10105):1829. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32461-3
6. Chung WK, Erion K, Florez JC, et al. Precision medicine in diabetes: a Consensus Report from the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetologia*. 2020;63(9):1671-1693. doi:10.1007/s00125-020-05181-w
7. Cameron NE, Eaton SE, Cotter MA, Tesfaye S. Vascular factors and metabolic interactions in the pathogenesis of diabetic neuropathy. *Diabetologia*. 2001;44(11):1973-1988. doi:10.1007/s001250100001
8. Callaghan BC, Hur J, Feldman EL. Diabetic neuropathy: one disease or two? *Curr Opin Neurol*. 2012;25(5):536-541. doi:10.1097/WCO.0b013e328357a797
9. McCarthy MI. Painting a new picture of personalised medicine for diabetes. *Diabetologia*. 2017;60(5):793-799. doi:10.1007/s00125-017-4210-x
10. Hamman RF, Bell RA, Dabelea D, et al. The SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study: Rationale, Findings, and Future Directions. *Diabetes Care*. 2014;37(12):3336-3344. doi:10.2337/dc14-0574
11. TODAY Study Group. Risk Factors for Diabetic Peripheral Neuropathy in Adolescents and Young Adults With Type 2 Diabetes: Results From the TODAY Study. *Diabetes Care*. 2021;45(5):1065-1072. doi:10.2337/dc21-1074
12. Ahlqvist E, Storm P, Käräjämäki A, et al. Novel subgroups of adult-onset diabetes and their association with outcomes: a data-driven cluster analysis of six variables. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2018;6(5):361-369. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(18)30051-2

13. Varghese JS, Carrillo-Larco RM, Narayan KV. Achieving replicable subphenotypes of adult-onset diabetes. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*. Published online July 2023:S221385872300195X. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(23)00195-X
14. Zaharia OP, Strassburger K, Strom A, et al. Risk of diabetes-associated diseases in subgroups of patients with recent-onset diabetes: a 5-year follow-up study. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2019;7(9):684-694. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(19)30187-1
15. Treatment options for type 2 diabetes in adolescents and youth: a study of the comparative efficacy of metformin alone or in combination with rosiglitazone or lifestyle intervention in adolescents with type 2 diabetes. *Pediatr Diabetes*. 2007;8(2):74-87. doi:10.1111/j.1399-5448.2007.00237.x
16. American Diabetes Association Professional Practice Committee. 2. Diagnosis and Classification of Diabetes: Standards of Care in Diabetes—2024. *Diabetes Care*. 2023;47(Supplement_1):S20-S42. doi:10.2337/dc24-S002
17. Study Details | TODAY Genetics Study | ClinicalTrials.gov. Accessed September 26, 2024. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT00722397>
18. Moghtaderi A, Bakhshipour A, Rashidi H. Validation of Michigan neuropathy screening instrument for diabetic peripheral neuropathy. *Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery*. 2006;108(5):477-481. doi:10.1016/j.clineuro.2005.08.003
19. Herman WH, Pop-Busui R, Braffett BH, et al. Use of the Michigan Neuropathy Screening Instrument as a measure of distal symmetrical peripheral neuropathy in Type 1 diabetes: results from the Diabetes Control and Complications Trial/Epidemiology of Diabetes Interventions and Complications. *Diabet Med*. 2012;29(7):937-944. doi:10.1111/j.1464-5491.2012.03644.x
20. Arnold K, Ellison G, Gadd S, et al. Adjustment for time-invariant and time-varying confounders in ‘unexplained residuals’ models for longitudinal data within a causal framework and associated challenges. *Stat Methods Med Res*. 2019;28(5):1347-1364. doi:10.1177/0962280218756158
21. RUBIN DB. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*. 1976;63(3):581-592. doi:10.1093/biomet/63.3.581
22. Varghese JS, Narayan KMV. Ethnic differences between Asians and non-Asians in clustering-based phenotype classification of adult-onset diabetes mellitus: A systematic narrative review. *Primary Care Diabetes*. Published online 2022:4. doi:10.1016/j.pcd.2022.09.007
23. Akinci G, Savelieff MG, Gallagher G, Callaghan BC, Feldman EL. Diabetic neuropathy in children and youth: New and emerging risk factors. *Pediatr Diabetes*. 2021;22(2):132-147. doi:10.1111/pedi.13153

24. Diabetic neuropathy in children and youth: New and emerging risk factors - PubMed. Accessed September 15, 2024. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/33205601/>
25. TODAY Study Group, Levitt Katz LE, White NH, et al. Risk Factors for Diabetic Peripheral Neuropathy in Adolescents and Young Adults With Type 2 Diabetes: Results From the TODAY Study. *Diabetes Care*. 2022;45(5):1065-1072. doi:10.2337/dc21-1074
26. Jaiswal M, Divers J, Dabelea D, et al. Prevalence of and Risk Factors for Diabetic Peripheral Neuropathy in Youth With Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes: SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Study. *Diabetes Care*. 2017;40(9):1226-1232. doi:10.2337/dc17-0179
27. Jaiswal M, Lauer A, Martin CL, et al. Peripheral Neuropathy in Adolescents and Young Adults With Type 1 and Type 2 Diabetes From the SEARCH for Diabetes in Youth Follow-up Cohort. *Diabetes Care*. 2013;36(12):3903-3908. doi:10.2337/dc13-1213

Table 1. Descriptive characteristics of the analytic sample stratified by identified subphenotypes

	Total	yMOD	ySIDD	ySIRD
<i>N</i>	641	311 (48.5%)	120 (18.7%)	210 (32.7%)
SEARCH	304 (47.4%)	86 (27.7%)	94 (30.9%)	124 (40.8%)
TODAY	337 (52.6%)	225 (72.3%)	26 (7.7%)	86 (25.5%)
Age at diagnosis (years)				
≤ 13	245 (38.2%)	120 (38.6%)	48 (40%)	77 (36.7%)
14-15	146 (22.8%)	72 (23.2%)	28 (23.3%)	46 (21.9%)
> 15	250 (39%)	119 (38.3%)	44 (36.7%)	87 (41.4%)
Female %	641 (58.2%)	311 (60.8%)	120 (60%)	210 (53.3%)
Race-Ethnicity				
<i>NH White</i>	172 (26.8%)	77 (24.8%)	41 (34.2%)	54 (25.7%)
<i>NH Black</i>	205 (32%)	80 (25.7%)	42 (35%)	83 (39.5%)
<i>Hispanic</i>	208 (32.4%)	127 (40.8%)	27 (22.5%)	54 (25.7%)
<i>NH Other</i>	56 (8.7%)	27 (8.7%)	10 (8.3%)	19 (9%)
<i>Key biomarkers for clustering</i>				
BMI (kg/m ²)	34.5 (6.5)	33.5 (3.7)	29.3 (6.1)	38.8 (7.3)
HbA1c (%)	6.1 (5.6, 7)	5.7 (5.4, 6.2)	7.6 (6.3, 8.9)	6.2 (5.8, 7.4)
Fasting C-peptide (ng/mL)	3.8 (1.8)	3.5 (1.4)	2.1 (1.1)	5.1 (1.8)
LDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	90.7 (27.9)	80.2 (22.1)	109.4 (30.1)	95.7 (27.5)
HDL cholesterol (mg/dL)	39.2 (9.2)	37.1 (7.3)	48.2 (9.6)	37.2 (8.3)
Systolic BP (mmHg)	114.2 (11.6)	109.3 (9)	109.7 (10.2)	124 (9.4)
Diastolic BP (mmHg)	68.8 (9.7)	64.2 (7.4)	67.8 (8.2)	76.2 (9.1)
<i>Other biomarkers</i>				
Fasting glucose (mg/dL) ^a	106.5 (21.3)	102 (18.2)	117.3 (25.9)	114.8 (24)
Fasting Insulin (uU/mL) ^a	30.1 (22.2)	26.2 (18.4)	20 (10.3)	43.4 (27.8)
Total cholesterol (mg/dL)	154.8 (36.1)	140.2 (27.9)	181.7 (36.6)	162.3 (36.3)
Triglycerides (mg/dL) ^a	107.7 (67.1)	101 (57.5)	82 (40.7)	133.1 (87.1)
<i>DSPN</i>				
MNSI Measured	501 (78.2%)	268 (53.5%)	80 (16.0%)	153 (30.5%)
Abnormal Examination	113 (22.6%)	32 (28.3%)	32 (28.3%)	49 (43.4%)
Abnormal Questionnaire	67 (13.4%)	29 (43.3%)	8 (11.9%)	20 (29.9%)

Abnormal Examination or Abnormal Questionnaire	146 (29.1%)	52 (35.6%)	34 (23.3%)	60 (41.1%)
--	-------------	------------	------------	------------

^a Only available for TODAY (N = 337); yMOD: Youth-onset Mild Obesity-related Diabetes, ySIDD: Youth-onset Severe Insulin Deficient Diabetes, ySIRD: Youth-onset Severe Insulin Resistant Diabetes

Data are mean (SD) or median (IQR) for continuous variables and frequency (percentage) for categorical variables. Abnormal examination and abnormal questionnaire were defined as scores ≥ 2.5 and 4 respectively.

Table 2. Prevalence ratio of distal symmetrical polyneuropathy by subphenotype

Prevalence ratio (95% CI)	Unadjusted	Adjusted
yMOD (reference)	Ref (1.00)	Ref (1.00)
ySIDD	2.73 (1.84, 4.04)	2.58 (1.74, 3.81)
ySIRD	2.3 (1.59, 3.34)	2.02 (1.4, 2.93)

^a Only available for SEARCH (N = 304);

yMOD: Youth-onset Mild Obesity-related Diabetes, ySIDD: Youth-onset Severe Insulin Deficient Diabetes, ySIRD: Youth-onset Severe Insulin Resistant Diabetes

Associations are prevalence ratios from marginal structural Poisson regressions using multiple imputation for missing covariates and inverse probability weights for non-participation in Michigan Neuropathy Screening Instrument assessment. Abnormal neuropathy score is adjusted for age category, female sex and race-ethnicity.

Figure. Distribution of clinical characteristics by subphenotype

